REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested. Claim 1 is amended.

Rejection of Claims 1-5

The Examiner rejects claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended claim 1 and removed the word "dot". Therefore, the term "desired anchor" has appropriate antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 now conforms to 35 U.S.C. Section 112 as well as dependent claims 2-5.

Rejection of Claims 1-30 Under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e)

The Examiner rejects claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,011,562 to Gagne et al. ("Gagne et al."). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that Gagne et al. do not teach each limitation in the claims.

We first turn to claim 1. Claim 1 recites an electronic display system operative to facilitate interactive graphical interface animation. The system comprises a number of features including computer executable instructions for inserting a desired image into a first window, inserting anchors into a second window by for each anchor selecting a desired pose from a plurality of predetermined poses, and upon a cursor being dragged over the second window to a desired anchor, additively applying characteristics for the desired anchor to the desired image based on a proximity of the cursor to the desired dot anchor. The Examiner asserts that Gagne et al. teach the step of inserting anchors into a second window by selecting a desired pose from a plurality of predetermined poses at Figs. 8-9, feature 228, at col. 12, lines 14-31. The Examiner especially highlighted feature 228 at page 3 of the Office Action. Feature 228 is a non-linear editing (NLE) timeline component. As discussed in col. 12, lines 14-31, when the user drops an action into this component, the user releases the mouse button

an icon representing the action is placed in the track under where the drop occurred. An

activity bar is created and is associated with that icon. The user then can reposition or re-size

this icon for the action, select one or more portions of the total duration of the action to be

included in the composition of the animation by altering the activity bar and/or apply effects

to the action. Using the NLE timeline component 228, the user has the ability to modify

these actions and also has the ability to do mixer control for each track located in a mixer

component 232.

The Examiner appears to be equating the inserted anchor into the second window with

the actions that are dropped into the components 228 of Fig. 9. Applicant respectfully

submits that these are not the same feature and they do not have the same functionality. The

functionality of Gagne et al. requires the user to select an action such as a grimace action

under a defined category such as face for a particular animation. In the example at col. 12, of

Gagne et al., the user selects a grimace action from its face category and drags it to

component 228 for management in the timeline component 228. Once the action is in a

timeline as is shown in Fig. 8 of Gagne et al., the user may make modifications to the action

by repositioning or re-sizing the icon associated with the action. Applicant respectfully

submits that the action that is dragged and dropped into NLE timeline component 228 are not

the same thing as an inserted anchor that is inserted by selecting a desired pose from a

plurality of predetermined poses. The action and the icons associated with the action in

component 228 do not function as anchors. In this regard, Gagne et al. teach away from such

a characterization of these icons because these icons can be repositioned and/or re-sized. In

other words, Gagne et al. teach away from the insertion of an anchor because the inserted

icon can be repositioned and moved – certainly not characteristics of an "anchor."

Next, the Examiner equates the step of upon a curser being dragged over the second

window to a desired anchor additively applying characteristics for the desired anchor to the

desired image based on a proximity of the cursor to the desired anchor. The Examiner also

cites Figs. 8 and 9 as well as col. 9, lines 45-55 and col. 12, lines 1-21. Again, the Examiner

equates the desired action as the anchor in component 228 as the second window and applies

and equates that action with the recited anchor and the recited functionality of claim 1 as the

same thing as is taught by Gagne et al. in which they re-size the action by means of dragging

the mouse cursor on that anchor. Applicant respectfully submits that this is a very different

operation and functionality from that as is recited in claim 1. As mentioned above, Gagne et

al. do not teach inserting an anchor into a second window inasmuch as the actions and the

icons associated with those actions that are inserted in component 228 may be repositioned or

re-sized. As shown in Fig. 8 of Gagne et al., in the area of component 228 there are six

different icons and each in different positions and having different sizes. Clearly, none of

these icons can reasonably be termed as an anchor. Furthermore, there is no discussion in

Gagne et al. of additively characteristics for a desired anchor to the desired image based on a

proximity of the cursor to the desired image. The best the Examiner can do in attempting to

equate the Gagne et al. teachings with this limitations is to state on pages 3 and 4 of the

Office Action that re-sizing the action is done by means of dragging the mouse cursor on that

anchor. This is simply not the same functionality as is recited in claim 1. Again, this claim

requires an additively applying characteristic for a particular anchor to the desired image

based on the proximity of the cursor to the desired anchors. This clearly differs from the

process of using of perhaps a mouse cursor to re-size or relocate the action icon. There is no

discussion in Gagne et al. that equates to the functional interaction between the position of

the cursor to the desired anchor and how that positions causes additively the characteristic of

the desired anchor to be illustrated in the desired image. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully

submits that Gagne et al. fail to teach each limitation of claim 1. Applicant submits that

claim is passable and in condition for allowance.

       Claims 2-5 each dependent from claim 1 and recite further limitations there from.

Accordingly, these claims are passable as well.

Claim 6 recites a method for facilitating interactive express animation. This claim recites the steps of inserting anchors into a second window by selecting a desired pose from a plurality of pre-selected poses and dragging a cursor over the second window to a desired anchor wherein characteristics for the desired anchor are additively applied to the desired image based on a proximity of the cursor to the desired anchor. The discussion above makes clear when applied to claim 6 that Gagne et al. fails to teach these two limitations. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 6 is passable an in condition for allowance. Claims 7-10 each depend from claim 6 and recite further limitation there from. Therefore they are passable as well.

Independent claims 11, 15 and 23 each recite similar limitations to those discussed above. Accordingly Applicant respectfully submits that these claims as well as their respective dependent claims are passable.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections and objections, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. The Commissioner for Patents is authorized to charge or credit the **Law Office of Thomas M. Isaacson, Account No. 502960** for any deficiency or overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 8, 2006   By: /Thomas M. Isaacson/

Correspondence Address: Thomas M. Isaacson
John Etchells   Attorney for Applicant
AT&T Corp.   Reg. No. 44,166
Room 2A-207   Phone: 410-414-3056
One AT&T Way   Fax No.: 410-510-1433
Bedminster, NJ 07921